App. F. IX-4

Previous References

1928.
(Nagai)

File No. 430-28

Serial Nos. 1-9

Later References

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Serial Nos. 89

Part B for March 1930

SUBJECT

Appealing against the Asst. Comr's order directing that the Archakship of Sri Angalamma Swami temple at Vadur in the Nagapattinam Taluq be made out in the names of the Respondent Kesavachar

---

Do 1860 dated To the Asst. Comr.

7. 3. 1930.

Govt. have issued necessary instructions to appoint some other suitable person as the Archaka of the temple.

G. R. S. APP F.III—1] 1928.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Muzrai)

NOTES.

File No. 430-28

FILE HEADING.

Archakship of Sri Anjaneya Swamy temple at Varahur in the Nagadi Taluk.

FROM

V. G. Subba Rao, School-master,

~~No.~~ Petition Dated Received 5.6.29

Diary No.	Enclos.	Spare copies	Serial No
1850			1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER

Appeals against the Dy. C's order directing that the Archakship of the said temple be made out in the name of the Respondent — Ke Sanachar, and prays for a stay order pending disposal of his appeal petition —

NOTES AND ORDERS.

The petition was presented to the Member. Member's order: — Records may be called for. No stay order can be issued. It is represented that some amount belonging to the temple is in deposit. The disposal of this deposit should wait until

NOTES—First Sheet.

Serial No.

Orders on appeal are passed. May Communicated to the M.C

DFB - Submitted

7.8.29. Perused.

7/8

2 To The Dy Comr
C/No 2759 dt 13-6-29
Forwarded for report with records

3 To A. Dy. Commr
C/o Govt. Treasury
Hosdurga M.C.
C/No 2760 dt 13-6-29
Information is requested as to the fact
as to whether the Temple
has been registered.

4 From the M.C. Letter No. 2113 dt
8th Aug 1929.
Submits the Report with
records
3 The M.C.s order appealed
against gives full reasons for
registry of Archakship in the
name of the respdt - Kasaudhan
The temple is a Muz. institution
endowed with inam lands.
4 Before obtaining orders for
posting the case, the Exl. Cattle
for

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 01684—GPB—30,000—20-4-29

Serial No.

The extracts from the Inam Register with a view to know who the Archaka then was, is submtd. for appl or orders

AV 16/8/29

5 Dm 17/8

Lew 16/8

5 To. The Liaison Officer C/o 393 DT 12-8-29

Extracts to item 5 for perusal a copy of the Detailed Inam Register for Vizag & 3 villages of the Vizagapatam

Srs (V) WW 28/8

6. From, the Inam Supdt., Letter no. 67 Dy 21. 9. 1929.

Submits a copy of the detailed Inam Register pertaining to the temple lands-

P

& the lands are noted as Devadaya and are intended for weekly Puja (every Saturday) and support of Sri Hanumantaraya Swamy temple at Vakatada. No Pujari's name is mentioned in the Register.

7 From, Sanbag Venkatasubbarao and others Petition recd on 30. 9. 29.

Pray that the apltt. Subbiah, whose family has conducted worship for the last 50 years without any break may be

WD 01684—GPB—30,000—20-4-29

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 30 of 192 6

Serial No.

Confirmed in the Archakship.

7 As usually ordered, this case will be posted for hearing on the 9th December along with other cases, notices being issued to the apltt - V. G. Subba Rao, and his opponent - Re Sanachar - & Submtr. for orders.

8/11/29. 9/11

10 The records have been looked into. The preamble to the impugned order appealed against, gives a succinct account of the facts of the case.

11 The temple of Sri Brijaneya Swamy at Vanahur, Nagadi Taluk is a Mu. institution endowed with inam lands, and the present case relates to the Archak-ship of the temple - the Respt - Kesanachar - claims the office as Darkhast through his mother Nachanamma daughter of the elder brother of Srinivasiah the last holder of the office who and whose younger brother Gopaliah died without any children - the apltt's (V. G. Subba Rao's) case that his uncle was a Sumastha of the last holder Srinivasiah.

then the issue of notice a note of facts will be framed

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 666—GPB—30,000—26-7-29

Serial No.

that the minimal holders were Satanis and that the respondent is a Sri Vaishnava Brahman cannot succeed to the office which will have to go to him after his uncle - Archak Jumasha

12 The Sub Divl officer Mr M. Abdul Hukh before whom the matter went up, conducted an elaborate enquiry, and directed the registry of the office of Archakship in the name of the respondent Ramanuja as being the only person who can rightly succeed to the office of his maternal grand-father. and requested the Tahsildar to put Rangachar in charge of the office, and take possession of the temple inam lands from the apltt. Subba Rau - and deliver the same to the Registrar. As regards the apltt, he remarked that the apltt. claimed the post thro. his uncle who was only a Jumasha for one Srinivasa and stepped into the shoes of his uncle since 1916. and further that he (Subba Rau) who is in the permanent employment of Govt as a School master should not have been permitted

WD 01684—GPB—30,000—20-4-29

General and Revenue Secretariat | File No. 430 | of 192

Serial No.

to continue as Sumastha so long since 1916

13. Against this order, Subba Rao appealed to the D.C. and that officer dismissed the appeal with the observation that the apltt's family was not registered as karamavaran at any time that he claimed the office as a Sumastha and that it was open to him to establish his right by a regular suit. Subba Rao appealed to the D.C., and that officer has rejected his suit with the observation that as neither of the parties claim the office by virtue of direct succession to the original holders who were Satanis, and that he saw no reason to differ from the concurrent findings of the D.C. and sub. Divl officer resp.ly.

14 Against this order, he has appealed to Govt. - His case is posted & the 9 1/2 & notices have been issued to the contesting parties - His file will be submitted to the 1st member along with other cases.

15 Submit for orders

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 066—GRB—30,000—26-7-29

7/12

7.12.29

7/12

5709
27/2

Serial No.

17 Case called - Appellant represented by Mr S Krishnappa. Respondent present and requests that an adjournment may be allowed as the notice reached him only a couple of days back.

Will be taken up on the next date of hearing and fresh notices issued

Mysore
7-12-29

18 This case was heard on the 17th February 1930.

19 The Appellant was present and was represented by Mr. S. Krishnappa; the Respondent was present and his Lawyer Mr. S.N.Naraharaiya appeared for him.

O r d e r.

20 It is clear from the records that neither the Appellant nor the Respondent has any hereditary hak to the archakship of the temple of Sri Anjaneyaswami at Varatur in the Magadi Taluk. It has been established by the enquiry held that ~~the~~ Sathanis were the archaks of this temple some 50 years ago. The Appellant claims that the Sathani archaks transferred the archakship

Note—Contn. Sheet

WD 066—GPB—30,000—26-7-29

Serial No

archakship and the Inam lands of the temple to his uncle. The transfer is not supported by the approval of any Muzrai authority competent to sanction it. The Respondent claims the right to the archakship through his maternal grand-father, but he can neither explain how the latter got it, nor adduce any evidence in support of it. The members of the Respondent's family have not performed as a matter of fact, the duties of the archak for a long period and this is stated to be the result of ~~the~~ an arrangement according to which the Appellant uncle was treated as the gumasta for the performance of this work. This arrangement of gumasta is not also supported by the approval of any Muzrai authority. Neither party has any hereditary right to the office of the archak and the other considerations urged by them in their favour, are not entitled to much value. The Appellant is a school-master and ~~is liable to transfer~~ may not at any time be transferred from Partha. The Respondent is the archak of three other temples, viz., those at Tavarakere, Peanapalaya and Bychugupee. It will not be in the interests of the temple to appoint either of them as its archak. In view of all the circumstances of the case, it is desirable to appoint some

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 0024—GPE—60,000—21 5 27

General and Revenue Secretariat. Muz | File No. 430 of 192 8

Serial No.

other suitable person as the archak of the temple and action should be taken accordingly under section 36 Mug. Regln of 1927

Mug/C
26 : 30
h

21

22. Subd with a draft & also an Endt: to the party.

Gps.
6/3 Lew
6/3

23
6/3

To. The Mez Conr
8 No 1860 Q. 12-3-30
States that it will not be in the interests of the Temple to appoint either the applt. or the respondent as the archak and it is desirable to appoint a suitable person as the archak of the Temple

To Mr V G Subba Rao through his Advocate Mr S. Krishnappa
9 No 1861 Q. 12-3-30
Informs neither he nor his Kesavachar has any

NOTE—Contn. sheet

App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 430 of 1928.

Serial No.

hereditary right to the office of Archak and that instructions to appoint a suitable person as archaka the temple were issued

B

NOTE—Contn. sheet

WD 082—GPB—60,000 -27 0 27

11







D. 1880

Inwd 430-28

Records may be called for

Clerk order

Can be issued.

Inwd 5/6/29

His representation that some articles belonging to the temple is in deposit. The disposal of the deposit should wait until orders on appeal are passed. Otherwise this Govt. may be communicated to

Inwd 5/6/29

5/6

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE, BANGALORE.

APPELLANT:- V. G. Subba Rao, Schoolmaster, Varthur Village, Tavarekere Hobli, Magadi Taluk.

--(VS.)--

RESPONDENT:- Kesavachar, son of Srinivasachar, Tavarekere, Magadi Taluk.

The Appellant begs to appeal against the Order of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore in Appeal No. 28 of 28-29 dated 23-5-1929, confirming the order directing the Registry of the office of Archakship of Sri Anjaneya Swami Temple at Varthur in the Magadi Taluk being made out in the name of the Respondent, on the following among other

G R O U N D S :-

1. The learned Muzrai Commissioner erred in holding that the Respondent had made out a better claim to the Office than the Appellant without stating his reasons for so doing.

2. The Muzrai Commissioner, like the Deputy Commissioner, has failed to give his finding on the point of Law urged by the Appellant

Appellant that under Hindu Law the Respondent could not inherit to xx his maternal - grandfather's undivided younger brother, Srinivasaiya, who held the office last according to the Respondent (which, of course, the Appellant does not admit.)

3. The Muzrai Commissioner, who admits that neither of the parties claim the Office by virtue of direct succession to the original holders who are Satanies, should - have held that the Appellant has made out a better case as he claims from these very - Satanies xx in preference to the Respondent who denies that the Satanies were the original holders.

4. The Kandayam Receipts and Patta - Books since 1881-82 produced by the Appellant falsify the Respondent's case that his grandfather's younger brother, Srinivasaiya, appointed the Appellant's uncle in the year - 1890 alone.

5. The Lower Officers further erred - in ignoring the important fact that even the false lease deed of 1890 relied upon by the Respondent and produced at a very late stage of the case, recites that the Kandayam Receipts should be with the Respondent while they are with the Appellant and produced by him in the case.

6. The Respondent gave his grandfather the

the false name of Venkataiya (alias Venkatachar) for the purposes of this case, because the name of the original holder Satani was also Venkataiya while, in fact, the grandfather's actual name is Venkatarangachar, as described by the Respondent in a Geneological Tree furnished by him in the Kunigal Taluk - Office, a Certified Copy of which was produced by the Appellant before the Deputy Commissioner. This aspect of the case was not even considered by the Lower Officers, and t h e - Appellant's Application to the Deputy Commissioner to prosecute the Respondent for Perjury appears to have been totally ignored.

7. At all events the Appellant, who has been in possession of the Office in question for over 50 years, is in Law entitled to continue to be in possession until the descendants of the original holder Satanies come forward, (or, even according to the Respondent, - until Srinivasaiya's heirs under Hindu Law establish their better claims).

8. The Muzrai commissioner failed to consider that the Respondent, who was advancing inconsistent pleas, was not entitled to any relief. These inconsistent pleas, which took the Appellant by surprise at the trial, are:-

His case from the beginning is that his maternal grandfather's family was the origi-

nal

original Hakdar since three generations and that he claims as a descendant from such - Hakdars, but the evidence adduced by him at the Trial before the Sub-Division Officer - was to the effect that the Satanies were the original holders and that his maternal grandfather somehow got it from them for the first time between 1880 and 1890.

9. It is assumed by the Sub-Division Officer, without any kind of proof, that the Respondent's grandfather got the office from the Satanies, in spite of the party's allegation to the contrary, while the Appellant's - case that he got it from the Satanies is disbelieved, though it is not denied by the other side.

10. The Order appealed against is otherwise opposed to Law, facts and probabilities - of the case.

WHEREFORE, the Appellant prays that the entire proceedings connected with the case be obtained, and that the Registry of Office in question be ordered to be made out in the name of the Appellant and the office with the Inam lands confirmed to him, directing t h e Respondent to establish his claim in a Civil Court.

He further prays that, pending disposal of this Appeal, the Order appealed aga-

inst

against be stayed. Such a Stay Order had been issued both by the Deputy Commissioner and the Muzrai Commissioner.

Bangalore,
5th June, 1929.

Shishwappa.
Advocate for the appellant—

ONE RUPEE ೧ ರೂಪಾಯಿ EIGHT ANNAS ೮ ಆಣೆ

In the Court of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Appeal No 28 of 28-29.

Appellant.- V G. Subbarao Schoolmaster Varthur Village Javarekere Hobli Magadi Taluk.

Respondent. Kesavachar Son of Srinivasachar Javarekere Magadi Taluk

Subject Appeal against the order of the Deputy Commissioner Bangalore District dismissing the appeal of V.G. Subbarao against the order of the Sub-Division officer Closepet directing the registry of the office of the archakship of Sri. Anjaneyaswami at Varthur in the name of the respondent

Facts of the Case

The above temple is a muzrai institution endowed with inam lands of an extent of 6-12 as detailed in the margin. In a petition of 29-11-1926 to the amildar the respondent claimed the archakship of the temple as the legal heir of the previous hakdar archak and requested that the archakship may be got back to him from the appellant the amildar enquired into the case and examined witnesses on both sides but on account of two parties in the village who took sides no definite opinion of the villagers could be got. And as no documentary evidence was produced the amildar felt a

S. No	5 dry	5-15
—	39 wet	0-37 jodi
		6-12 Rs 6-00

A1

JUN 3 1929

doubts as to the rightful heir and recommend B1
the appointment of respondent who was found to (Reports p 324)
be a fit person as pujari as the appellant
was a School master On this recommendation,
the Sub-Division officer ordered on 16-2-24 that the B1
Karavandars might establish their right in a
Court of law and that till then Kesavachar (respondent)
might continue to perform puja. On 16th March
1925 the appellant approached the Sub Division C1
officer and prayed for the Cancellation of the
previous order recognising the claim of the respondent
since he had been performing the puja for the past
50 years the Sub-Division officer then ordered on
17-5-25 that the respondent Kesavachar need
not be appointed but the appellant may be
continued as archak and directed that Kesavachar
should establish his right in a competent Court.
Upon this Kesavachar went in appeal to the Dy Comr
who after hearing Counsel on both sides remanded for a decision
the Case on 30-3-26 to the Sub-Division officer on
merits observing that it was not proper for the
Sub-Division officer to decline the jurisdiction
conferred on him by Sec 33 of the Mysore Regulation
to decide pujari dispute and force parties to go to
the costly remedy of the Civil Court. In pursuance of
the order the Sub Division officer held a formal enquiry
recording the evidences of witnesses on both sides
and after examining the previous records and the
several exhibits produced by the parties and hearing
the arguments of their Counsel passed an order on
30-6-28 directing that the office of the Archak
be registered in the name of the respondent ——
Kesavachar the Sub-Division officer observed that
the appellant's uncle was only a Gumasta of the
last holder Srinivasiah that the appellant himself
stepped into the shoes of his uncle in 1916, that

was no dispute till the old gumasta was alive since he was sharing the Rajpal of the Inam lands with the Nakdar family and the dispute arose after his death the greed of the appellant to keep back the share of the respondent's family having brought matters to a head and resulted in them pulling forward their claim to discharge the archak duties themselves. It was further held by the Sub-Division officer that the respondent derived his title as dowhitra through his mother Nachamma daughter of the elder brother of Srinivasaiah the last holder of the office, who and whose younger brother Gopaliah died without any children and that he was the only person who could rightly succeed to the office the amildar was asked to put the respondent in charge of the office and take possession of the Inam lands from the appellant V.J. Subba Rao and deliver the same to the appellant. Against this order the appellant went in appeal to the Deputy Commissioner who dismissed the same on the ground that the Muzrai regulation did not debar a daughter or her son from inheriting the office of an archak and as such the right of the respondent to succeed to the office cannot be questioned and that the appellants family was not at any time registered as baradars and the claim was as a gumasta and it was open for him to establish his right by a regular suit the present appeal is against

as well as the respondent are heard

Order No R Dis 179 of 28-29 dated 23-5-29

Neither of the parties claim the office by virtue of direct succession to the original holders who were Sataris. On the whole I see no reason to differ from the concurrent findings of the Deputy Commissioner and the Sub-Division officer that the respondent has made out a better claim to the office. The appeal is rejected

Sd) P. B. D'Souza.
Mujrai Commissioner

Copy applied for 30-5-29
copy ready 4-6-29
copy delivered 4-6-29

No words 826
Copying fee
Comparing fee
Compared by
N. Narasimhaiah

- Copy 4

R. Y. Narasimha Ayyangar.
Dy Mujrai Comr
AL

20



Before the Govt of H. H the Maharaja of Mysore ಕೋರ್ಟಿಗೆ.

1928-29ನೇ Misc app ನಂಬರು.

ವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ್ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಯಾ ಅಪೋನೆಂಟ್

ವಿ ಜಿ ನಂಜುಂಡಯ್ಯ ಕೃಷ್ಣಪ್ಪ

Vs.

ಅಡ್ವೋಕೇಟ್ ಮು॥ ರಾ॥ ಎಸ್. ಕೃಷ್ಣಪ್ಪ ನವರಿಗೆ.

ಅರ್ಜಿದಾರ ಬರಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟ ವಕಾಲತ್ ನಾಮಾ

ಈ ಮೊಕದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನನ್ನ ಸರವಾಗಿ ಆಫೈರುವರಿಗೂ ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ವಿವಾದ ಜರಿಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ನನ್ನ ಪರ ಆಗುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಧವಾದ ಆರ್ಡರನ್ನೂ ಡಿಕ್ರಿಯನ್ನೂ ಜಾರೀಕ್ರಮ ನಡಿಸಿ ಹಣವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ರಾಜಿ ವಗೈರೆ ಪೈನಲ್ಯಾಡಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಯೂ, ನನಗೆ ಕೋರ್ಟ್‌ನಿಂದ ನಲ್ಲಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಮೊಬಲಗು, ಶಿಲ್ಕು ಮೊಬಲಗು ರೀಫಂಡು ಸ್ಟಾಂಪು ಮೊಬಲಗು ದಸ್ತೈವಜು ವಗೈರೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಾವಸುವಡಿಯಲಿಕ್ಕೂ ಸಹ ತಮಗೆ ಈ ಮೂಲಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ತಾವಾಗಲಿ ಯಾ ತಮಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ಯಾವ ಲಾಯರಾಗಲಿ ಡಿಟೋ ಮೊಕ ದ್ದಮೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ನಡಿಸುವ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಾನು ಖುದ್ದು ಇದ್ದು ನಡಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿ ಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಬದ್ದನಾಗಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ

ವಿ. ಜಿ. ನಂಜುಂಡಯ್ಯ

3-6-1929

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತಾರುನಾಮೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟವರು ನನಗೆ ಪರಿಚಯಸ್ಥ ರಾಗಿ ನನ್ನ ಸಮಕ್ಷಮ ರುಜು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತಾ[illegible]

S. Krishnappa.

ತಾ: 3/6/29

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.

ಈ ಮೊಖ್ತಾರುನಾಮೆ ಅಂಗೀಕರಿಸಿ ಇದ್ದೇನೆ

S. Krishnappa.

Advocate for appellant

5/6/1929

21

BJECT.....

.....

.....

2DB

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section Jud. B

File No. 430 - 28

Serial No. 2,

No. [illegible]

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 192

To

..... The D. E. O. .....

Date of issue.....

Signed by .....

Sir

I am directed to forward herewith for report with remarks, petition no. 1880 from V. G. Subba Roo, School-master, appealing against your order directing that the Archakaship of Sri Anjaneya Swamy temple at Vanahir, Nagadi Taluk, be made over in the name of The Hereditary Archaka, and to state that the appt has been informed that no stay order

st of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

Can be issued as prayed for by him.

I am to add that a representation made that some amount belonging to the temple is in deposit, and to request that if there is so, further action in regard to the disposal of this deposit should await until orders on appeal are passed.

I have etc.

Illegible

Illegible

Illegible 430-28-8

With ref. to his appeal petition No 1880 presented on behalf of V. G. Subbarao Re The Archakship of Sri Anjaneya Swamy temple at Varthur, Bagadi Taluk, Mr. S. Krishnappa. Dove for the appt., is informed that a report with records has been called for in the petition, and that no stay order can be issued as prayed for by him.

By order,

Illegible

23

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore,.....7th August.....1929

8

No. 2113 Rm 57 files
28-9

FINANCIAL SECTION
8 AUG. 1929
No.

FROM

P. G. D'Souza, Esq., P.A., P.L.,
The Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

MYSORE
9 AUG 1929
MUZRAI

19 216

TO

B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His
Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Financial Department.

Mng 430-28-4

SIR,

With reference to your letter No.2759/Muz.430-28-2 dated 15th June 1929 forwarding for report with records petition from V.G. Subba Row, School Master, appealing against this office order directing -- that the archakship of Sri Anjaneyaswamy temple at Varbur, Magadi -- Taluk, be made out in the name of the respondent Kesvachar, - have the honor to forward herewith the connected records received with the Bangalore District Deputy Commissioner's letter No.C.3-64 of 28-30 dated 1st August 1929 (copy herein enclosed).

This office file No.R.Dis.179 of 28-29 dated 23rd May 1929 --- containing the order appealed against, the preamble of which gives the facts of the case is also enclosed for reference and kind return.

The appeal petition together with its enclosures received with your letter under reference is herewith retransmitted.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Muzrai Commissioner.

Letter No;C.3-64/29-30 dated 1st August 1929 from the Deputy Commissioner, Pangalore District to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Subject:-- Appeal against order of the Muzrai Commissioner by V.C. Subba Rao in re the Archakship of Varthur temple, Magadi Taluk.

With reference to your memo No.2113/28-29 dated nil, calling for the submission of the file of records connected with the above - subject, I have the honor to submit the entire file of vernacular -- records ending with Closepet Sub Division Officer's No.A3-45/29-30 dated 22nd July 1929 together with a bundle of exhibits produced by both the --- parties in the case.

2. This office appeal file No.3/28-29, containing the full facts of the case is also enclosed for favour of your reference.

"C o p y"

For Muzrai Commissioner.

25

Section
File No. 4 -0-
Serial No. 6

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

No.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

To Inam Supt.
Nellore.

Date of issue.....

Signed by .....

5 to 5 Dmy a g
— 39 Wet 5-15
— 6-12 with a 0-37
Rs 6-0-0. Jodi

st of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

Sir,

I am directed to request that you will be so good as to send up for reg. at a very early date, a copy of the Detailed Inam register pertaining to the grant of the marginally noted lands as Inam for the up-keep of Sri Anjaneya Swamy temple at Pantur in Nagari Taluk.

over

WD 0399—GPB—20,000—18-9-28

Rajakaryaprasakta
Diwan Bahadur M.N.Krishna Rao Esq., B.A.,
First Member of Council.
Bangalore.

Honoured Sir,

Archikship of Sree Anjaneyaswamy
Temple at Varthur, Thavarekere Hobli
Magadi Taluk.

In connection with the dispute for the hakdari of the above archikship that has nowcome up to your table for decision, we the residents of Varthur Village, beg to lay before you the fallowing facts:-

The original hak for the above archikship is stated to belong to one Vengaliya of a Satani Family who/sons left the place some 50 years ago during the great famine, handing over the charge of the archikship to one Subbiah of the same vallage whose descendants are performing the puja ever since then. to the entire satisfaction of all of us. But very recently a rival belonging to a Sri-Vyshnava Family by name Kesavachar has sprung up and is contesting for the archikship of the Satani Family stating that the original hakdars were also Sri-Vyshnavas. and that he descended from them which is not true.

This Kesavachar is not a resident of this place and is a litigant always wandering to courts. He somehow managed to get charge of the archikship very recently and ever since he took charge, no pooja is being performed in the temple.

The previous archik Subbaiah who is now appealing

ever giving room for a single complaint. It is/an real y injustice that this man should be deprived of the archikship whose family has been doing the pooja for the last 50 years without any break. We therefore request you to kindly confirm the archikship.on this man in view of the fact that thare are no original hakdars existing and that this man is doing the work from a long time regularly and satisfactorily, so that there may be regular pooja in the temple hereafter at least.

We beg to remain,.
Honoured sir,
Your most obedient servants.

10.9.29



Office of the Superintendent,
[illegible], 20

No.67 Dated, [illegible]

Pro.

23

T. Griffiths Tyrrell, Esq., [illegible],
Solicitor to the Board of
Revenue & Secretary to the Land
[illegible] G A T

Inv 430-28

T. Griffiths Tyrrell, Esq., M.A., F.I.,
Financial Secretary to the Government
of the Straits Settlements, Fort Canning.

Sir,

As desired in your letter No. 3[illegible]/[illegible]
dated 23-3-1928, I have the honour to forward herewith
copy of the Land Rules [illegible] grant of
Industrial or Agricultural [illegible],
[illegible].

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

D. Smith

SUPERINTENDENT.

Regd for Sheet No 248
"

Village Varthur
Hobli Gavarekere
Taluk Magadi

Number of case or entire holding under one grant in this village	General class to which the Inam belongs	Survey No. and name of field or fields comprised in the grant. Dry, wet or garden	Local measure. Even where the local measure is in acres, guntas, and annas, it is to be entered in this column	Measure in acres and their fractions in decimals.
1	2	3	4	5
1	(1) wet dayā	Survey Dry No. 5 Web 24	N. g. in accel of 1808 Hirabuvag. K. C. P 0 - 7 - 0 0 - 5 - 0 0 - 12 - 0	

Old assessment	Survey assessment	Description of Inam If for service, it is to be stated whether the service is continued. If for tanks, buildings, etc., whether they are efficiently kept up Hereditary or for life	Whether free of tax, etc., or liable to quit-rent, i. e., jodi, etc., amount of latter to be entered
Where no survey has been made and no assessment fixed by Government, the cess paid by the raiyats to the Inamdar, or the average assessment of similar Government land, should be entered in column 7			
6	7	8	9
Rs. a. p 6. 8. 2 0. 9. 4 7-1-6		It is the duty of the Superintendent of Amaniahs to see that the village watchman keeps the Amaniah clear of rubbish and grass and prepares to repair the bund before the rains set in.	Q. J. V. Q. J. P 2 — 0 5. 13. 1 Paid from the year 1834/35
Bund P. J. V. Dry. 2 2. 6 Wet 0. 2 — 0 2. 4. 6			

By whom granted and in what year	Written instruments in support of the claim, original sannad, al documents, and other proofs of long possession. In this column it should be stated whether the Inam is held with or grant, whether the grant is produced or lost, etc., and the general sp terms of all documents produced should be given.
10	11

Name of original grantee	Name entered in the register prepared by Poornah up to 1810	Name entered in the account subsequent to 1810
12	13	14
	A. Jeeriya &c Hanamanthanaya Swamy Dry 0 7 0 2 2 6 Wet 0 5 0 0 2 0 0 12 0 2 4 6 Jooy 2 0 0 Gany 0 4 6	(B 67 Hga of 1831 Same as in 1816

Particulars regarding present owner. If the inam has been subdivided, the na
sharer should be entered in the columns

Residence, name an l age, etc.	Relation to original grantee or subsequent registered holders	Surviving heirs of the present incumbent	If unconnected with original holders. no sion how obtained and in what year
15	16	17	18
Varthur Hanumantha anaya Swami Manager Pillodan			

Abstract of the orders already issued by the Commissioner or the Superintendent of the Division on lapses regarding validity or excess of the Inam. Assistant's opinion and recommendation.	Review by the Special Assistant and confirmation by the Inam Commissioner
19	Whole grant 20 GH. GH
1 Whole grant Valid 2 H.J.a of 1808 a dopted 3 Exact object not known. 4 To be confirmed on the post of Rs 6-0-0 under rule V I.I.D. (Sd) Syed Nasrudeen 7.8.76 Assistant	1 (W.G.) D eva day a Jari Inam 2 Confirmed on the post of Rs 6/ (Sd) R.A.Cole Superintendent of Inam Settlements 21.10.76 GH Ag. Compared "Copy" GH J. Narasimhachar Retd 19.9.23 for Superintendent of Inam Settlements.

GPB—1,000 books of 2 sheets each—9-8-06.

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF H.H. MAHARAJA.

Muzrai Appeal No. 11 of 29-30.

* * * *

APPELLANT;- RESPONDENT:-

V. G. Subba Row. -(Vs)- Kesavachar.

@ @

The Appellant begs to submit the following arguments:--

1. (a) The Inam title deed was in the possession of the appellant and is produced by him in the case.

(b) The pattas and Kandayam receipts from 1881 to 1927 have been produced by the appellent which show beyond all doubt that his uncle Subbaiya has been, - since 1881, doing the Archana work and enjoying the - lands. The possession of these Kandayam receipts with the appellant does not consist with the recitals in the alleged lease deed of 9-5-1890 according to which they should be with the respondent.

(c) In the Sidharti chitti of 1859 -60 the - Archak name is Yengalaiya.

(d) In the Khatwar of 1875-76, Yengalaiya, Venkataiya and Narasaiya have been mentioned while the - siggature there-in appearing is Yengaiya.

2. These facts probabilise beyond doubt that Satanies were hakdars and that about prior to 1881 they handed over the Inam lands and archana work to the Appellant's uncle and that Venkataiya and his son Narasiya executed the deed of 1890, while these facts are totally inconsistent with the Respondents case that the Hak belongs to his grandfather and his ancestors and that under his lease deed of 9-5-1890, Subbaiya was let into possession.

3. In the Mohazar drawn up in 1917-18 by the Amildar Mr. A. Raja Row, the villagers have stated tha the original hadkars were Satanies and that the appellants uncle got it from these ~~Hakdar~~ Haldar Satanies. Mr. K. Ananthapadmanabhaiya B.A., B.L., as Amildar in his final report No. 810, dated 13-2-1924 has reported that the Respondent is a new man.

4. It is a finding of fact by the Sub Division Officer that the original Hakdars were Satanies and this finding is confirmed by the Muzrai Commissioner in his order. The Appellants case that he has divided his title from these Satanies is therefore more believable than the Respondent's palpably false story that the Hak belongs to his grandfather and his ancestors, and that it never belonged to Satanies. Further while the appellant's title deed of 1890 is clearly from these Satanies, the recital in the Respondent's forged deed of 9-5-1890 is that his ancestors have been doing the work from time immemorial. If the Appellents deed of 1890 cannot be acted upon for want of registration, the Respondent's deed of 9-5-1890 is equally invalid for want of registration.

The

The Appellants document is a stamped paper and one - of ~~the~~ its attestors Eerachannaiya has been examined while the Respondents lease deed is plain paper and none of its attestors has been examined.

5. The evidence adduced by the appellant ~~with his case~~ in the course of the trial is totally inconsistent with his case. While he says that the - Hak belongs to his maternal grandfather and ancestors, his own witness Narayani admits that the Satanies were the original Hadkars and not the Respondent's ancestors. While the Respondent avers that his grandfather did not get it from the Satanies, the Sub Division Officer makes out a new case for him thus. He finds that the Satanies were Hakdars but concludes without anykind of evidence that the Respondent's grandfather somehow got the Hak - from them prior to 1876-77. The title deed relied upon by him is wrongly interpreted and understood by him.

6. Both the Deputy Commissioner and the Muzrai Commissioner have ignored the most important fact that the Respondent had given to his grandfather the false name of Venkataiya alias Venkatachar for the purposes - of this case with the fraudulent object of fitting in with the Satani name of Venkataiya. His grandfather's name was in fact Venkatarangachar as described by him - in a geneological tree furnished by him in the Kunigal Taluk office, in a patta case of the same grandfather's - lands claimed by him as Douhitra. This aspect of the - case has been ignored in the lower courts.

7. As stated by the Respondents, his grandfather Venkatarangachar had two younger brothers viz., Srinivasachar and Gopalachar. But in the khatuni extract of 1876 77 totally

totally different names viz., Yengalaiya, Venkataiya and Narasaiya appear. This inconsistency cannot be explained at all if the Respondent's case is believed while this is the Appellant's very case.

8. The appellent's possession and enjoyment for over 50 years have not been considered.

9. The villagers and devotees do not want the Respondent to do the work. Firstly because he is residing in a different village and secondly because the Swami was being till now worshipped according to Smarthagama while the Respondent being a Srivaishnava does service according to a different agama altogether. In this connection, the Appellant ~~himself~~ humbly suggests that as done by the Muzrai Commissioner in several such other disputed cases the votes of the villagers as between the appellant and the Respondent may be taken and he that get a majority may be ~~preserved~~ preferred.

10. Further S. 36 of the Muzrai lays down that when a majority do not want a Pujari, he should be removed. In the present case, the villagers in an overwhelming majority do not want the Respondent while it is a finding of fact that Satanies and not he are Hakdars.

W H E R E F O R E the appellant prays that the appeal be allowed.

17-2-1930

J Krishnappa.
Advocate for the appellant



In the Govt **Court of** the High Court of Judicature Bangalore

No. *of 192 —192*

Plaintiffs, Appellants, Petitioners. **Defendants, Respondents, Opponents.**

V. C. Subbarao

Vs.

Kempaiah

I/We, Kempaiah .....abovenamed, do by these presents retain

MR. S. N. NARAHARAYYA, B.A., LL.M., Advocate,

Counsel in the above case and do hereby empower him to appear, plead and act and make all applications for and on my/our behalf in the above case, to take all steps which may be necessary on my/our behalf arising out of, or in connection with the above case either during its progress or after its decision, to sign and subscribe his name to any document which he may deem proper, to execute any decree that may be passed in my/our favour and to receive from or out of the Court any or all moneys that may be lodged or become payable or receivable on my/our behalf and on receipt thereof to grant receipt or other sufficient discharges for the same, to receive from the Court all refunds, documents, etc. that may become due to me/us, to withdraw, compromise or refer to arbitration the said case, to appoint one or more substitutes and to act and perform all other matters and things relating thereto or connected therewith, to represent me/us in matters relating to the same and *generally* to act as fully and effectually, to all intents and purposes as I/we might do if I/we were personally present and did the same. And further I/we do hereby agree to pay the said Advocate all fees he would charge and costs, charges and expenses which he may incur on my/our behalf and to allow, ratify, and confirm whatsoever he may lawfully and in his discretion do or cause or procure to be done by virtue of these presents

In witness whereof I/we have hereunto set my/our hand *or* mark this Fourteenth day of February 1930.

ACCEPTED

S. N. Narahariyya
17-2-30

Signature [signature]

Signed before me by the executants who is/~~are~~ known to me.

S. N. Narahariyya
17-2-30

Makkala Pustaka Press, B-City.

Appeal 14.2.30

TWO RUPEES ౨-౦

Reference. Muz appeal no 11 of 29-30 posted for arguments 10-2-1930

REV. SECTT.
15 FEB 1930
1279
MUZRAI.













లతా దాశస్త్రి జూలి, ఝానామంతి దేవదాంయకా
ల్యాకి చెంగల్పాత్తు డిస్ట్రి ౧౮౩౧ ఖర సంవత్సరంలగ
డింబర ౧౮ వర్తిగ

దేవస్థానంలలు	మంజర్తి కంటరాయి	ఉబ్బళ్ళకరి శాయి
౬౧౪	౫౧౮౦।।।=	మొరంరాగద్దె

× × × ముప్పు బిజువరి × × ×

× × × తేరి జువిరానం × × ×

మంజర్తి × × ×

× × × ప్రవీరాదూరి సంవత్సర వర్తిగ

దేవస్థాన	మంజర్తి	బంది
౬౦౪	× × ×	× × ×

వివర ——————

× × × × × × × × ×

× × × × × × × × ×

× × × రాలి ఖర సంవత్సరద వర్తిగ బాఢి, ఫ్ ఉబ్బళ్ళరాగద మరిదు
మొరాల రూకం ప్రరాత్రక్ష్మి పూంగరుక్ష్మి

దేవస్థాన	మంజర్తి	జువిరానుబంది
౧౦	× × ×	× × ×

వివర ——————

× / ౫౧౮౦।।।=	× × / ౬౧౪	× × / × × ×

గిరాలబాలస్వామి దేవస్థానక్షిక్ష్మి మంజర్తిలుల్లు

× × ×

రావంస్థావిం దివస్థానే శర్వి కంలం వుంజుశ్రీ

× × ×

ఓంనాధస్థావిం దివస్థాన గర్వి

× × ×

సర్వేంధ్యాస్థావిం దివస్థాన భర్వి వుంజుశ్రీ

× × ×

వరద రాజుస్థావిం దివస్థానే శర్వి వుంజుశ్రీ

× × ×

ఆదినా రాంవుణా స్థావిం దివస్థాన గర్వి

× × ×

వేంకటరమణా స్థావిం దివస్థాన ఒర్వి వుజుశ్రీ

× × ×

రంగనాథ స్థావిం దివస్థాన ఒర్వి వుంజుశ్రీ

× × ×

లక్ష్మీ నా రాంవుణా స్థావిం దివస్థాన ర్వి వుంజుశ్రీ

× × ×

వల్లభ రాంవు స్థావిం దివస్థాన ర్వి వుంజుశ్రీ

× × ×

కెంపు రాంవు స్థావిం దివస్థాన ఇర్వి వుజుశ్రీ

× × ×

తిరుమల దివర్వి దివస్థాన ర్వి గర్వి వుజుశ్రీ

× × ×

అమృత నా రాంవుణా స్థావిం దివస్థాన గర్వి

× × ×

భ్యాట రాంవు స్థావిం ఇర్వి వుంజుశ్రీ

× × ×

శివ దివస్థానేగ ళుబ్రళ వి వుంజుశ్రీ

కి చింగళూత్రి సిగ్ం ೨.೧.೨೦೦೦ ಅಗ್ರಾಯಂ ೧೮೦
పర్రిగే

పరిభద్రిస్వామిరా దివస్థానం గంకి మంజుశ్రీ

× × ×

మినాంతుం బివత్రు దివస్థానభ్యం మంజుశ్రీ

× × ×

ఒస్ను పంగాన దివస్థాన గంభకి మంజుశ్రీ

× × ×

రూసు మంది రాంతుస్థావిం దివస్థానస్థ్రీకి మంజుశ్రీ

× ×

విపరం _____

೨೧೬॥೦ చిప్పూరం కాల్యాంన్నం। ధ్రంకి మంజుశ్రీ

× × ×



೧೪೪॥೨॥ కాలుతాకి కృష్ణా కాజుపో ంన్నం।೨೬೦

೨೧೧೦= క్రొలాజుపరి ೧೦॥೪ గడ్డిజుపరి
೪೪॥೪೩॥. ೪॥೪॥೩೨॥೦

೨೧೦॥೪॥= ೧೦೦॥೪೩೦

క్రిం జేతాడి ೧೬೧॥-

విపరం _____

జూకా చూం మంజుశ్రీ

೧೪೪॥೨॥

విపరం _____

೦॥೧೦ స్సిచి పరిపాశ్రి చ్యాటి ంరుం ంరుం
పదివస్థానకి అర్ంకం క్రిజా ೩೪೪೦
జా త్రిం ంర్యు _____

೦॥೪॥೦ క్రొలా ాజుపరి ೦ంశ్రీ
೬೭ గడ్డి జువినాసు ೦೨॥೦೦

೧೪೨॥೦ _____

క్రిం జేతాడి ೦॥೧೦

జూకా చూం మంజుశ్రీ॥೦॥

పూ॥ రుసుం వెంకటరాయుడ్యాం

అంబుగి జమీనాను నగరేశ్ బుంచప్పగి

వగైరా పరిహారి భోగ్యా

× × × × × ×

× × × × × ×

× × × × × ×

× × × × × ×

అంకితాను దివదాయం జారి సేదరి మ్యోతగే —

ఫ్రగళ సాగువళి = ఫ్రభు॥ సు॥ వరు॥

ఒంపోజి చే సేదరిరేకు సాలు ప్రే వ్యాక్తగళు

రుజు వెంకటరావే మూరుంతి జాక్ష్యగళు

పుకాటి అంబంల్లదే.

రుజు దస్తిర నారళ్యోంయ్య
అయుండిద్దే

రుజు దస్తిర పుటేంయ్య
అయుండిద్దే



Chief Secretary to Govt. 10.12.30

ఓటు పత్రాకుగళ సంఖ్యే 305

ఒరవణి సిరంస్సు	0-5-4	కాపి మాంయిష్ కారిఅు 24-1-1930
చేరాబిలారంస్సు	0-1-4	కాపి రంగూరాబ కారిఅు 8-2-1930
రాగద ఖరిది	0-0-3	కాపి పత్ర వేశి కారిఅు 10-2-30.
జుమ్లా	0-6-11	

చెంగళ్వరాయనవరు ఉళ్కొండ చేరి అంబ్లకుద లడ్డుగళ్ట

మరు యుగో కల్పిస్లు ప్రే సేదరి హోరడి అంబంకే క్లైగే మోరుశుంది

యుగ్వా కోట రంగూరాద్యరు కల్పిసిద్దారే.

K. Ranga chandra Rao
In charge of Vernacular
Secretariat

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Appeal No. 11 of 1929-30.

Appellant.	Vs.	Respondent
V. G. Subba Rao. School-master. Karthur, village Tavarekere Hobli Magadi Taluk.		Keshava chari, Son of Srini-vasachari. Tavarekere. Magadi Taluk.

Subject.

Appeal against the order of the Mang: Comm^r. directing that the Archakship of Sri Anjaneya Swamy temple at Karthur be made over to the name of the Respondent

---

The Case was heard on the 14th Feb. 1930. The Appellant was present and was represented by Mr. S. Krishnappa The Respondent was present and his Lawyer, Mr. S. N. Narahariaya appeared for him

Order

Here Copy 1st Members Minute para 20 of the Nikarsi Temple.

Memo: No

ruled 12-3-30

1860 Mly 6.30.

Present 1 Hrs Copy to the Mang. Comm^r. returning the Records Case received with his letter No: 2113 dated 14 Feb 30 p. 24

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Muzra Appeal No. 11 of 1929-30.

Appellant.	*Vs.*	Respondent
V.G. Subba Rao, Schoolmaster Vartur village, Tavarekere Hobli, Nagadi Taluk.		Keshavachar, son of Srinivasachar Tavarekere, Nagadi Taluk.

Subject.

Appeal against the order of the Muzrai Commissioner, directing that the Archakship of Sri Anjaneyaswamy temple at Vartur be made out in the names of the Respondent.

The case was heard on the 17th February 1930. The Appellant was present and was represented by Mr. S. Krishnappa. The Respondent was present and his Layer Mr. S.N. Narahariaiya appeared for him.

O R D E R .

It is clear from the records that neither the Appellant nor the Respondent has any hereditary hak to the archakship of the temple of Sri Anjaneyaswamy at Varatur in the Nagadi Taluk. It has been established by the enquiry held that Satanis were the archaks of this temple some 50 years ago. The Appellant claims that the Sathani archaks transferr the archakship and the Inam lands of the temple to his uncle. The transfer is not supported by the approval of any Muzrai authority competent sanction it. The Respondent claims the right to the archakship throug

GPB-1,000—8-8-11

o an arrangement according to which the Appellant's uncle was treated as the gumasta for the performance of this work. This arrangement of gumasta is not also supported by the approval any Muzrai authority. Neither party has any hereditary right to the office of the archak and the other considerations urged by them in their favour, are not entitled to much value. The appellant is a school-master and may at any time be transferred from Varatur. The respondent is the archak of three other temples, viz., those at Tavarekere, Pednapalaya and Rythuguppe. It will not be in the interests of the temple to appoint either of them as its archak In view of all the circumstances of the case, it is desirable to appoint some other suitable person as the archak of the temple and action should be taken accordingly under Section 35, Muzrai Regulation of 1927.

Memo No. 60 Mis:430 38/Revs & Coll dated, Bangalore, the 7th March 1930.

Copy of the above is forwarded with compliments to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, returning the records received with his letter No.2113 dated the 7th/8th August 1929.

By order,

for Secretary to Government,
Financial Department.

C.R.C.S.

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Muzrai Appeal No. **11** of **1929-30.**

Appellant.	*Vs.*	Respondent
V.G. Subba Rao, Schoolmaster Vartur village, Tavarekere Hobli, Magadi Taluk.		Kesavachar, son of Srinivasachar, Tavarekere, Magadi Taluk.

Subject.

Appeal against the order of the Muzrai Commissioner, directing that the Archakship of Sri Anjaneyaswamy temple at Vartur be made out in the names of the Respondent.

The case was heard on the 17th February 1930. The Appellant was present and was represented by Mr. S. Krishnappa. The Respondent was present and his Lawyer Mr. S.V. Narahariya appeared for him.

O R D E R .

It is clear from the records that neither the Appellant nor the Respondent has any hereditary hak to the archakship of the temple of Sri Anjaneyaswamy at Varatur in the Magadi Taluk. It has been established by the enquiry held that Satanis were the archaks of this temple some 50 years ago. The Appellant claims that the Sathani archaks transferred the archakship and the Inam lands of the temple to his uncle. The transfer is not supported by the approval of any Muzrai authority competent to sanction it. The Respondent claims the right to the archakship through

GPB—1,000—8-8-11

the duties of the archak for a long period and t s is stated to be the result of an arrangement according to which the Appellant's uncle was treated as the gumasta for the performance of this work. This arrangement of gumasta is not also supported by the approval of any Muzrai authority. Neither party has any hereditary right to the office of the archak and the other considerations urged by them in their favour, are not entitled to much value. The Appellant is a school-master and ~~may~~ may at any time be transferred from Varatur. The Respondent is the archak of three other temples, viz., those at Tavarekere, Pednapalaya and Rychuguppe. It will not be in the interests of the temple to appoint either of them as its archak. In view of all the circumstances of the case, it is desirable to appoint some other suitable person as the archak of the temple and action should be taken accordingly under Section 35, Muzrai Regulation of 1927.

Memo No. dated, Bangalore, the 7th March 1930.

Copy of the above is forwarded with compliments to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, returning the records received with his letter No. 2113 dated the 7th/8th August 1929.

By order,

For Secretary to Government,
Financial Department.

G.R.G.

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *192*

Date of issue 12-3-30

Signed by M.V.K.S.Jr

List of enclosures .....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

Section Mez

File No. 2630-25

Serial No. 9

No. 1861

To Endt: granted to mr V Ti Subba Rao. School master. Varthur village. Tavarekere ~~Taluk~~ Magadi Taluk. Their Advocate. Mr. S. Krishnappa.

With reference to his appeal petition dated 5th June 1929 appealing against the order of the Mez: Commr: directing that the Archakships of Sri Anjaneya Swamy temple at Varthur be made out in the name of the Respondent mr. Kesavachar, the appellant is informed that neither ~~the~~ he nor the Respondent mr. Kesavachar has any hereditary right to the office

over

of ~~them as its Archaka / Poor~~

have issued necessary instructions

to the Asst: Commr to ~~select~~ appoint some

other suitable person as the Archaka

of the temple under Sec. 35 of ~~after taking action~~ to take necessary action according

the Asst: Regulation of 1927

By order

7/3

For Asst: Secy to Govt

- Gs 6/3